

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

NOAH LUKE HOLLAND,

Defendant and Appellant.

A156554

(Sonoma County Super. Ct.
No. SCR-711542-1)

Defendant and appellant Noah Luke Holland pled no contest to sexual abuse and burglary charges and was sentenced to 25 years to life in prison. Appellant's counsel has raised no issue on appeal and asks this court for an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any arguable sentencing or other post-plea issues. (See *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not filed a supplemental brief. We affirm.

BACKGROUND

In July 2018, an information was filed charging appellant with six counts, with enhancements, arising from a January incident in which appellant broke into a house in Rohnert Park at night, entered the bedroom of an eight-year-old girl, and anally penetrated her with his fingers.

In December 2018, pursuant to a negotiated disposition, appellant entered a no contest plea to one count of committing a lewd and lascivious act on a child under the age

of 14 (Pen. Code, § 288(b)(1))¹, with sentencing allegations under section 667.61, subdivisions (e)(2) and (j)(2), and one count of first degree residential burglary with a person present (§§ 459, 667.5, subd. (c)).²

In February 2019, the trial court, in accordance with the plea agreement, imposed a term of 25 years to life on the sexual abuse charge and a concurrent six-year upper term on the burglary charge. The court imposed and stayed fines and fees, and directed appellant to pay \$2,025 to the Victim's Compensation Board.

DISCUSSION

Appellant's no contest plea restricts the scope of the appeal before us. Because he did not request a certificate of probable cause, his appeal is limited to "postplea claims, including sentencing issues, that do not challenge the validity of the plea." (*People v. Cuevas* (2008) 44 Cal.4th 374, 379; *People v. Brown* (2010) 181 Cal.App.4th 356, 359–360.)

We have reviewed the entire record and have found no arguable appellate issues. The trial court's sentence was proper. The trial court properly imposed a concurrent sentence on the burglary offense under section. The fines, fees, and restitution imposed by the court were proper.

Appellate counsel advised appellant of his right to file a supplemental brief to bring to this court's attention any issue he believes deserves review. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106.) Appellant did not file a supplemental brief. There are no legal issues that require further briefing.

DISPOSITION

The trial court is directed to correct the abstract of judgment to specify the sentencing enhancements associated with the two counts of conviction. As modified, the judgment is affirmed. The court shall transmit a corrected copy of the abstract of judgment to the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

¹ All undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

² The abstract of judgment fails to specify the enhancements associated with the two counts. We will direct that the abstract be corrected.

SIMONS, Acting P.J.

We concur.

NEEDHAM, J.

BURNS, J.

(A156554)